



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/961,320	09/25/2001	Hajime Enomoto	826.1754	5808
21171	7590	09/08/2005	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005				REVAK, CHRISTOPHER A
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2131		

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/961,320	ENOMOTO, HAJIME	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher A. Revak	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 September 2001.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-4, 6-15 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 5 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 September 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>see attached</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d).

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on September 25, 2001 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
5. The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

In claim 8, lines 3-4, it is recited of "conflicting operation modeling means for generating..." then recites "...based on the security matching constraint..." and further

recites "... a model against a conflicting..." in which is the wording appears to be a literal translation.

In claim 10, lines 5-7 recite "location information between an original pattern in which a waterwork pattern is embedded and the waterwork pattern" which appears to be a literal translation and additionally seems to be an incomplete sentence.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-4,6-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Birnbaum, U.S. Patent 5,797,128.

As per claims 1 and 14, it is taught by Birnbaum of a service provision system comprising a common platform as an interface function with a client and a object network for communicating through the platform and providing a service intentionally requested by the client. The object network comprises a hierarchical structure . A data model in which an attribute structure of the object network is determined as a template. An object model that is positioned higher in rank than the data model and has a matching constraint on security. A role model is positioned higher in rank than the object model and expresses a content of a process to be performed in an environment as an aggregate of a plurality of object models. A process model is positioned higher in

Art Unit: 2131

rank and defines a dynamic process to be performed by a plurality of role models as one process. A security matching constraint check unit/means ensures security of a system by checking a security constraint attached to the template (col. 2, lines 14-25; col. 2, line 58 through col. 3, line 2; col. 8, line 64 through col. 9, line 11; and col. 10, lines 16-30).

As per claim 2, it is disclosed by Birnbaum of a security matching constraint check unit checks access to a system that does not provide sufficient data to authenticate intension of an appropriate execution process (col. 8, line 64 through col. 9, line 11 and col. 10, lines 16-30).

As per claim 3, Birnbaum teaches of the communications of a system are implemented by a communications role function corresponding to the role model. The security matching constraint check unit further comprises gate means for checking attribute structure data of the communications medium with a security constraint in a role model corresponding to the communications role function (col. 8, lines 43-48; col. 8, line 64 through col. 9, line 11; and col. 10, lines 16-30).

As per claim 4, it is disclosed by Birnbaum that when a service intentionally requested by the client is provoked, the security matching constraint check unit checks an access right to a system of a person concerned related to the intention (col. 5, lines 26-39).

As per claim 6, Birnbaum teaches of a sentence structure analyzing means for improving visibility for a client by analyzing a sentence structure of the object and

displaying a sentence structure obtained by the analysis on the common platform in order to sustain a security of the system (col. 6, lines 50-59).

As per claim 7, the teachings of Birnbaum disclose of integration processing means for improving efficiency of an entire process of a system using a security matching constraint attached to the template when a process to be cooperatively performed by the plurality of role models (col. 8, line 64 through col. 9, line 11 and col. 10, lines 16-30).

As per claim 8, Birnbaum discloses of conflicting operation modeling means for generating based on the security matching constraint a model against a conflicting operation that has the possibility of executing a malicious service against a person concerned receiving a service from the service provision system as a result and the security matching constraint check unit checks the conflicting operation using a model (col. 8, line 64 through col. 9, line 11 and col. 10, lines 16-30).

As per claim 9, it is taught by Birnbaum of a conflicting operation modeling means that describe the matching constraint based on a relationship between a specific word and a specific operation (col. 2, lines 14-25 & 40-51; col. 8, line 64 through col. 9, line 11; and col. 10, lines 16-30).

As per claim 10, Birnbaum discloses of a matching constraint check unit judges a target pattern using a matching constraint, including location information between an original pattern in which a waterwork pattern is embedded and the waterwork pattern (col. 2, lines 14-25 & 40-51).

As per claim 11, the teachings of Birnbaum disclose of restricting communication services, conducting event drive as communications intention of an operating person concerned, authenticating a communications system, confirming occurrence of a communications event based on a security matching constraint, requesting a service as communications business if data are matched. A communications attribute structure is authenticated and confirms the service requested based on security matching constraints of a communications content structure. The communications service is requested when data of the communications operation are matched (col. 2, lines 9-25 & 40-51; col. 2, line 58 through col. 3, line 2; and col. 8, lines 43-48).

As per claim 12, Birnbaum teaches of issuing a data non-matching message if data are not matched when the data are checked based on both the occurrence of a communications event and the security constraint and issuing a data non-matching message if data are not matched when the data are checked based on the security matching constraint of a communication content structure (col. 2, lines 9-25 & 40-51).

As per claims 13 and 15, Birnbaum discloses of an object network system comprising a unit/means setting a security matching constraint in each object and a unit/means checking the security matching constraint (col. 8, line 64 through col. 9, line 11 and col. 10, lines 16-30).

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claim 5 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Bonn et al, U.S. Patent 6,738,908

Scheifler et al, U.S. Patent 6,138,238

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher A. Revak whose telephone number is 571-272-3794. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 6:30am-3:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CR

September 5, 2005

Christopher Revak
Primary Examiner
AU 2131


9/5/05